

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-22 are presented for examination, of which claims 1 and 17 are independent.

Claims 1 and 17 have been amended. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Fig. 4 and in the specification.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Independent claim 1

Independent claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over Rabinowitz (U.S. 5,325,002) in view of Gamble (U.S. 5,777,420). However, we submit that neither Rabinowitz nor Gamble, alone or in any proper combination, discloses or suggests a superconducting electric motor comprising “a rotor assembly including: a plurality of superconducting windings ... , a laminated support member that supports the superconducting windings, and an induction structure ... ; the laminated support member including laminations, a first set of laminations oriented in a first orientation and a second set of laminations oriented in a second orientation different than the first orientation...” as recited in amended claim 1.

The Examiner concedes that Rabinowitz’s support member is not laminated (Office Action dated 5/15/08, page 2), but suggests combining Rabinowitz’s support member with Gamble’s laminated iron core. However, Gamble’s iron core does not include “a first set of laminations oriented in a first orientation and a second set of laminations oriented in a second orientation different than the first orientation,” as recited in amended claim 1. Instead, as shown in Fig. 5, all of Gamble’s laminations have the same orientation. Furthermore, nowhere does Gamble disclose or suggest the possibility of a first set of laminations oriented in a first orientation and a second set of laminations oriented in a second orientation. Thus, we submit that, even if one of skill in the art were to combine Rabinowitz’s support member with Gamble’s laminated iron core, one would still not arrive at the superconducting electric motor of amended claim 1.

For at least this reason, independent claim 1 is allowable over Rabinowitz in view of Gamble. Since claims 3-16 depend from claim 1, these claims are allowable for at least the same reason claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 17

Independent claim 17 was rejected as being unpatentable over Rabinowitz in view of Gamble and Renard (U.S. 3,904,901). Claim 17 also contains the limitation “the laminated support member including laminations, a first set of laminations oriented in a first orientation and a second set of laminations oriented in a second orientation different than the first orientation,” which, as discussed above, is neither disclosed nor suggested by Rabinowitz or Gamble, alone or in any proper combination. Renard does not disclose a laminated support member. We thus submit that the superconducting electric motor of claim 17 is neither disclosed nor suggested by Rabinowitz, Gamble, or Renard, alone or in any proper combination.

For at least this reason, independent claim 17 is allowable over Rabinowitz in view of Gamble and Renard. Since claims 18-22 depend from claim 17, these claims are allowable for at least the same reason claim 1 is allowable.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.


Applicant(s) : Swarn S. Kalsi
Serial No. : 09/371,692
Filed : August 10, 1999
Page : 9 of 9

Attorney Docket No.: 30020-082001
Client Ref. No.: AMSC-382

No fees are believed to be due. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit
Account No. 50-4189, referencing Attorney Docket No. 30020-082001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 3, 2008


Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306

Customer No. 69713
Occhiuti Rohlicek & Tsao LLP
10 Fawcett Street
Cambridge, MA 02138
Telephone: (617) 500-2501
Facsimile: (617) 500-2499
41177.doc